

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 45 No. 16

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1965.

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Inspectorate

A true but weird tale from *American Opinion*, May, 1965

Naivete was a good friend of mine—nice, cheerful, never mean-minded. Of course, you couldn't exactly discuss world affairs with her. But that was all right. That is, until the poor dear got interested in world affairs and would discuss nothing else.

One day she talked me into going with her to a symposium held by the World Peace Foundation.¹ My friend hasn't been the same since!

Upon arrival at the old brick building on Beacon Hill, we milled around the lobby with "Liberal" intellectuals. Naivete positively gushed. She went on about how the speakers were being so wonderfully humane and civilised, and of course she was terribly impressed by the important positions each held in our great society. If she had produced an autograph book from out of her vast leather handbag I would not have been in the least surprised.

"Just look around you," Naivete glowed. "All these people are dedicated to saving mankind from nuclear holocaust. They love peace and abhor violence. Not like *your* friends. Some of *them* are professional killers."

That was a swipe at certain officers of the armed forces we know, but I let it slide since a drift to the meeting rooms had begun. We followed along and found ourselves inconspicuous places among the Establishment types, all sleek and prosperous from foundation grants and government jobs. We heard quite a few speakers, drifting from session to session. My friend Naivete had little to say. I did not intrude upon her state of quiet inner confusion.

We listened to the reading of a paper by a British psychiatrist, Dr. Henry V. Dicks.² Dr. Dicks was matter-of-factly discussing the care, feeding, and training of "Peace Force mercenaries." The eminent psychiatrist expressed his highest approval of Gurkha units and of the Foreign Legion, and wanted many of both types in the coming Peace Force. In fact, as he insisted upon that very thing, I shot a quick glance at Naivete in time to watch her usually blank expression turn to one of curiosity and then puzzlement.

Dicks was quite frank:

In an international force, only exceptional characters, somewhat rootless, polyglot, or dedicated are likely to benefit by finding a new identity in a UN force. We cannot

¹ World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Massachusetts. The "symposium" described did not actually occur. Quotations are from the published symposium papers appearing in the Spring, 1963, issue of the Foundation's journal, *International Organisation*. The foreword to this issue credits the Rockefeller Foundation for financial help in this "probe of the benevolent objectives of international force".

² Henry V. Dicks, "National Loyalty, Identity, and the International Soldier", *International Organisation*, Vol. XVII, No. 2.

risk the force's becoming a refuge for psychopaths. If, however, there were enough tough . . . military types, such recruits might become the most mobile and dedicated group of the force. They would not be bothered by national affiliations. It is likely that many of them would be deviants, including various political defectors. . . .

I could tell by Naivete's restlessness that she did not consider all of this much of a recommendation. But Dr. Dicks concluded by labelling his ideal mercenaries as "men of the future," and who could be against "men of the future?"

When the talk was over, most of the audience moved outside, and we drifted in the ebb tide. Naivete was pensive. Finally she spoke. "Gee," she said, "I always thought the Foreign Legion was full of ex-Nazis and criminals, and was just used by the French Imperialists."

"So?"

"So how come he thinks so much of the Foreign Legion?"

"He's thinking of all the good *he* could do with it." I could hardly suppress a grin. But then I was reminded of one of Dr. Dicks' earlier remarks, and fumbled through my notes. "You must remember," I told Naivete, "that there are some kinds of soldiers these peace-lovers don't approve of. Remember this?" I read from my notes: "Nationalistic, authoritarian men who choose the role of brave defender of the nation as a suitable outlet for their superpatriotism.' Do you see what he's saying? He's saying that a man who wants to defend his country is a nasty fellow who ought to be suppressed, while whoever signs up for the Peace Force is a man of the future. These people are not interested in morality. They only know that a pure mercenary is much more useful to them than some fellow who's patriotic."

Naivete didn't argue about it, but she didn't agree, either. We walked silently to the next meeting. A Harvard economics professor Dr. Thomas Schelling was going to tell us about "Strategic Problems of an International Force."³

I confess that I enjoyed Schelling. He was even more gratifyingly frank than Dr. Dicks had been. He seemed to assume that he was talking to like-minded people and had **nothing to fear** in the way of publicity. And so it was that the good Dr. Schelling dispensed with the eyewash used in the mass media. That, as you may have gathered by now, was just what I was hoping for. He told us about the objectives of the Peace Force, its "invulnerable nuclear deterrent," its possible financing through critical monopolies granted to it, how to "ease out of positions of confidence" those citizens of selected victim countries who are UN members,

³ Thomas Schelling, "Strategic Problems of an International Force", *op. cit.*

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 40/-; Six months 20/-; Three months 10/-.

Offices: Business: 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1.
Telephone: EUSton 3893.

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1, Telephone EUSton 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

how to provide an industrial base not subject to slowdowns, strikes, and sabotage by the working classes, and so on. [pp. 465-475]

When Schelling concluded one point by saying, “. . . we get a strategic force absolutely committed to preventative war . . .,” Naivete gasped. After all, she had been conditioned to consider preventative war as both evil and unthinkable.

The professor now went on to outline his thoughts on the employment of the Peace Force:

By “pain” I mean sheer coercive damage. Nuclear or other weapons might be used to inflict civil damage at a rate sufficient to induce a government to bend to the will of the international authority. By “conquest” I mean invasion or occupation.

“He wants to kill innocent people!” Naivete exclaimed in a terrible audible voice. “Liberal” intellectuals, disturbed in their great, pure, generous thoughts, turned to glare at us.

Dr. Schelling never broke pace: “Activities aimed at causing confusion, revolt of the population, or civil war . . .,” he went on, “would, of course, involve different tactics.” But in a moment he had Naivete in an uproar again. “Moving extra forces into the United States . . .”

“The *United States!* I thought he was an American!” she cried. Naturally I joined the “Liberals” in shushing her, because I wanted to hear the rest of it.

“. . . would, of course, be a major political move. The purpose . . . would be to minimise the cost and delay of invasion, occupation, or selective destruction.” [p. 478]

Naivete was becoming difficult to control. Unperturbed, however, Dr. Schelling went on with his recommendations. He suggested holding American cities hostage, or giving the Peace Force a monopoly of critical medicines. Then, “As soon as it starts an epidemic. . .”

Poor Naivete jumped up. “He’s out of his mind! What can we do?” she screamed in horror.

The peace-lovers had taken about enough from her. Honestly,

I heard cries of “Get ‘em Pancho!” It seemed a good time to leave, as a large Mexican bouncer appeared. We ducked out the other door, well ahead of Pancho.

It was not only embarrassing, but I hated to miss the rest of Schelling’s proposals. I reproached Naivete. “We should never have snuck in on your great-uncle’s tickets. He’s on the Board of Trustees, isn’t he? Suppose he finds out how you disturbed the meeting?”

Naivete was still hopping mad. “That man was *either a nut or a traitor*,” she fumed emphatically.

“I’ve often wondered whether it’s legally possible to be both.”

“All he talked about was armies and bombs and force and hostages and . . . why he talked about bombing his own country like it was nothing!”

“Well, what are you surprised about? You read *Fail-Safe*, didn’t you? These people lie awake nights dreaming up excuses for bombing their own country. That kind of patriotism, they understand.”

“If he were a Communist, I could understand it. . . .”

“Look, he’s a Progressive. He loves all mankind. Such people are therefore unprejudiced, and free to, uh, eliminate *anyone*, regardless of race, colour, creed, or national origin, who gives them any lip; that’s democracy honey. You ought to read more.”

Unfortunately, Naivete took my advice literally. A week later, she telephoned and asked me to meet her at the university library.

The poor soul had Stack Pallor, like a graduate student. She was thumbing a joint issue of a disarmament journal.⁴ I could see it coming, and subdued my impulse to smirk.

She eyed me and demanded, “What’s this jazz about the Inspectorate?”

“You sure you want to know?”

“I’m sure.” She had hardened. I sat down with her.

“Well, you know about the Peace Force. That will be a very strong nuclear-armed force that can control the whole world. Right?”

“That’s what they said,” she murmured, still touched with wonder.

“Okay. Now, the one thing that frightened those generalissimos of the Peace Force we heard last week was the idea of an enemy who might actually be *armed*. Right?”

She nodded in glum agreement.

“Here’s where the Inspectorate comes in. The Inspectorate would be created to make sure, not just that only the Peace Force has weapons, but that nobody else in the world even thinks about making weapons.”

“But how can they expect to do that, really?”

I thought perhaps a good place to begin would be where she was holding the pages apart with her fingers. “What were you reading?” I inquired.

Naivete sighed; this was requiring some very hard adjustment for her. “This? It’s an article on ‘Social Inspection,’ (she checked) by Thomas O’Sullivan.⁵ It says, ‘The most intimate forms of social inspection are psychological and physiological

⁴ Joint issue, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. VII, No. 3, and *Journal of Arms Control*, Vol. I No. 4, September-October, 1963. These journals are affiliated with the University of Michigan. The joint issue contains published papers presented at the International Arms Control and Disarmament Conference held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in December of 1962.

⁵ Thomas O’Sullivan, “Social Inspection”, *op. cit.*

examination. They might be performed on a carefully selected group of decision-making elite.⁶ Then he lists the elite—just everybody who's anybody in the United States. And then there's this part about electro-mechanical devices, and truth serum, and third-degree tactics. . . . It's crazy. I tell you the man's a nut, a subversive. . . ." Yes, Naivete was coming along.

"All right, take it easy. Electro-mechanical devices are merely greatly improved lie detectors. Lewis Bohn has a lot more on that.⁶ Like where they could put the wires and radio transmitters in you, so they don't miss it when you get butterflies in the stomach when they're questioning you."

"You're kidding now. Cut it out."

"Not at all. 'Butterflies' is a real physical reaction, but you have to have a person's stomach wired up to detect it. Your muscles also tense. Lots of things happen. Mr. Bohn is calling for research in holding the pain levels down, because pain might spoil the readings."

"Is that what they mean by 'physiological inspection'?"

"Darn right."

Slowly, she turned to another page. "Then there's this business about truth serum. 'Truth serum,' he says, 'is still not well enough understood for us to know whether it would be effective in prying the truth from people who are living a socially acceptable and highly patriotic lie.'" She lowered the book and just looked at me. "What kind of lie would that be, anyway?"

"Well, for instance, suppose the President started thinking about getting the United States out from under the Peace Force. If he were planning anything like that, and the Inspectorate asked him about it, and he said he wasn't planning any such thing, that's the kind of lie the Inspectorate would be interested in."

"You mean, somebody like O'Sullivan could just wire up the President of the United States? Why would the President even let them do it?"

"How could he stop them? No weapons, no armed forces, except the Peace Force, remember? That business is all in *State Department Bulletin 7277*, and is being prepared right now."

"That would mean Mr. O'Sullivan was more important than the President."

"Mr. O'Sullivan wouldn't mind that."

"Well, I'd mind!"

"Mr. O'Sullivan's associates will make a note of it."

I read ahead a little bit. "Still, look here, Naivete, he does show some restraint. He says, 'It is incredible to think of using third-degree tactics on this particular group of decision-making elite.' See, he wouldn't actually beat the President."

"That's something. But suppose you're not a member of this particular group of decision-making elite?"

"Tough."

We plowed through the rest of it: through the "second level of social inspection," which was spying on the "close friends, confidants, and members of the family" of the decision-making

elite; the third level, analysis of group behaviour and social patterns; the fourth level, monitoring and detailed analysis of the mass media, and so on.

"You mean they seriously propose to monitor all the things that are published in the world? That's impossible!"

I shrugged. "I wouldn't say that. In the first place, you could cut down the amount of material published by controlling supplies, labour, and the like. In the second place, it doesn't really matter how many people they have to hire to 'monitor' the remaining material, because they'll have all the money in the world to do it with, and all the force to see that those folks work."

"You know, when I first began looking into this, I came across something in Melman."⁷ She read:

It might be useful for some international agency to monitor ideologies and public discussion and opinion in a nation as an indication of efforts to generate an evasion mentality. Such efforts could be an alarm signal to the Inspectorate.
[p. 53]

"Oh, so you've found Melman. That means you've stumbled into a nest of them. Melman straw-bossed one of the first task-forces planning the Inspectorate. I suppose some day a grateful mankind will thank Columbia University properly for these pioneer efforts to make the police state look like a rural county Sheriff's operation." Okay, I was bitter.

"You mean, Columbia University is in on this too?" Naivete shrieked.

"We haven't scratched the surface of who's in on this scheme. But Columbia is deeply in on it. That Columbia crew has to be seen to be believed. There's E. J. Gumbel who boasts that he was three times charged with high treason; there's Dr. Szalita, who wants to re-educate whole populations, and use psychotherapy to cure them of 'evasion mentality'; there's Dr. Lazarsfeld, who recommends preying upon the average American's law-abiding nature by changing the laws to force 'compliance,' rather than bother changing public opinion; and there's Lazarsfeld's protege, William Evan who was detailed to get the raw potential informer rate for six non-Communist countries, to help in planning the Inspectorate."⁸

"Isn't that horrible? I didn't like anything I read in that Melman book. Look at these notes from page 252, he's attacking patriotism in the same way as Dr. Dicks. Thank God none of these people are really important. I can't believe this Inspectorate idea will ever get very far."

"Not important, you say? Melman has been called in to confer with President Johnson. Dr. Jerome Wiesner was President Kennedy's top scientific advisor, and he's up to his elbows in this. The late Dr. Leo Szilard, one of those who didn't worry about making the atomic bomb until it seemed likely to be used against Communists, had some dandy contributions to the Inspectorate idea. And you may be amazed to know that a frequent honoured guest at Inspectorate-planner gatherings has been Vice President Hubert Humphrey. If you look in this journal, you'll find that dear Hubert shared the spotlight with a Red named Karpov at the meeting where that O'Sullivan paper you've been reading was presented. The Vice President and Senator Fulbright are regular little helpers whenever they get the chance. These people are well-connected, Naivete. This is no nut deal. This is for real."

⁶ Lewis Bohn, "Non-Physical Inspection", chapter in *Arms Control, Disarmament, and National Security*, Donald Brennan, ed., Braziller, 1961. This book presents certain papers first published in *Daedalus*, Vol. 89, No. 4 (Fall, 1960). *Daedalus* is the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Financial assistance for the book's publication is credited to the Johnson Foundation of Racine, Wisconsin.

⁷ Seymour Melman, ed., *Inspection for Disarmament*, Columbia University Press, 1958.

⁸ William Evan, chapter on public opinion in Melman, *op. cit.*

"You mentioned Jerome Wiesner. What did he write?"

I groaned. "Don't expect a flash bibliography. But he did have a piece in *Arms Control* on how to conduct detailed inspection of the entire industrial establishment of the United States, which he says would be awfully useful for a planned economy. And he parrots Dr. Jay Orear of Cornell University. Dr. Orear is another one we can all be so proud of. Let me see if I can find his little contribution for you."

What happened was that I put in some slips for a few other books, and Naivete and I took a break. We went to the Student Union, that miniature Welfare State, and enjoyed some coffee and the company of the pleasantly simple-minded future leaders of America. Whether or not it bothered Naivete, I couldn't say, because we had agreed to drop the subject during our break, but it bothered me to know how very, very little those students were aware of.

About half an hour later we got back to the rockpile in the library. The brilliant blue cover of *Arms Control* topped the stack of books which had been placed on the table. Quickly I flipped to Wiesner's article, and his quotation of Orear's plan.

"As I was saying about Jay Orear, this is the plan which he presented to the Russians, in Moscow in 1960, at the Sixth Pugwash Conference."

"The what-wash conference?"

I threw up my hands in mock despair. "Whole separate story, kid. I'll give you some material on it by Duane Thorin tomorrow.⁹ He's been after the Pugwash peace-lovers for quite a while. It's this same type of thing, only they meet with the Soviets every six months or so to figure out what part of the disarmament programme to put over on us next. You should see the way they crowed about the Moscow Test Ban Treaty. You'll notice the Russians ignore it, too."

"I did notice. And we ignore how they ignore it, don't we?"

I glowed approval. "You're coming along fast. First thing you know, you'll be booted out of your International Relations class for Rightist deviation." We laughed. "And now to Dr. Orear's proposals for a treaty with the Russians."¹⁰

(1) *The treaty could give the international Inspectorate the right to ask any citizen questions concerning possible treaty violation. If desired, heads of state could be excluded without much loss of effectiveness.*

(2) *The treaty could legally require all citizens (except possibly heads of state) to answer all relevant questions when interviewed by the Inspectorate. It could provide for punishment of citizens who refuse to answer relevant questions, or who are found guilty of lying to the international Inspectorate.*

(3) *Substantial rewards (e.g. \$100,000 or more, non-taxable) could be provided for citizens who report verifiable violations to the Inspectorate.*

⁹ Duane Thorin, Monte Cristo Press, Vienna, Virginia, has several fine booklets on the Pugwash Movement.

¹⁰ Jerome Wiesner, chapter in *Arms Control: Issues for the Public*, Prentice-Hall, 1961. This book publishes papers discussed by Harry Wriston's "The American Assembly", which gathered at Arden House, Harriman, New York, May 4-7, 1961 to follow up the American Academy of Arts and Sciences' "Summer Study on Arms Control" in 1960. Jay Orear's recommended treaty provisions are also published in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, March 1961. This journal is an important outlet for Inspectorate proposals.

(4) *Assuming a reliable lie detector could be developed and proved [sic], the treaty could give the Inspectorate the right to use such an instrument in their interviews.*

(5) *The treaty could make it the duty of every citizen with knowledge of any treaty violation to report it to the international Inspectorate. Failure to report could be made punishable.*

(6) *The treaty could guarantee to a person reporting that he and his family can obtain sanctuary abroad whenever they so desire.*

(7) *There could be an agreement that the leaders of both sides must give such provisions their enthusiastic support on a regular basis through the mass media.*

—DR. ALLISON ANDERS.

(To be continued)

The powers vested in the undersecretary-general of the United Nations may well constitute the ultimate power of life and death over every human being on the face of the earth. There have been eight holders of the office. They have been communists without exception, seven from the USSR. That the United Nations Organisation is world communism under construction is revealed in

THE FEARFUL MASTER

by G. Edward Griffin

8/6d.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

A brochure dealing with the conspiracy behind the Vietnam "peace" moves, and behind Indonesia's threat to Australia, and containing a comprehensive list of books on the Conspiracy.

Free—on request

Pearl Harbour was deliberately provoked so as to get America into the war and take the Germans off the backs of the Russians. When the German armies finally disintegrated, the Americans held back so as to let the Russians take Eastern Europe and Berlin. When the Japanese surrendered, the Americans turned China over to the communists. Read in

AMERICA'S RETREAT FROM VICTORY

by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy

8/3d.

how American might has been perverted to the advancement of communism for the past quarter of a century.

From

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 5 New Wanstead, London E.11

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd. at 5 New Wanstead, Wanstead, London E.11.

Printed by E. Fish & Co. Ltd., Liverpool.